

Message Text

SECRET

PAGE 01 STATE 237183

67

ORIGIN ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ERDA-05 CIAE-00 H-02 INR-07

IO-10 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-04 PRS-01

SAJ-01 SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 USIA-06 TRSE-00 DODE-00

NSC-05 MC-02 SSO-00 /091 R

DRAFTED BY ACDA/IR:ABOHLEN

APPROVED BY ACDA/IR:AFLOYD

C:WSHINN

PM/DCA:CFLOWERREE

EUR/RPM:JHUFF

OSD:LMICHAEL

JCS:WFORRELL

NSC:MHIGGINS

ACDA:DENGEL

S/S-O: LMATTESON

----- 120792

P R 040203Z OCT 75

FM SECSTATE WASHDC

TO USMISSION NATO PRIORITY

INFO AMEMBASSY LONDON

AMEMBASSY BONN

USDEL MBFR VIENNA

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

S E C R E T STATE 237183

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM, NATO, MBFR

SUBJECT: MBFR: DEFINITION OF FORCES

REF: A. NATO 5208 DTG 241521Z SEP 75

B. NATO 5257 DTG 261310Z SEP 75

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 STATE 237183

C. NATO 5305 DTG 301241Z SEP 75

D. MBFR 426 DTG 271529Z SEP 75
E. MBFR 433 DTG 011215Z OCT 75
F. NATO 5381 DTG 021820Z OCT 75

1. TWO POSSIBLE COMPROMISE FORMULATIONS WHICH MISSION MAY USE AT ITS DISCRETION REGARDING PARA 4 (C) - 5 PROBLEM ARE OUTLINED IN PARA 5 BELOW. IN SUPPORT OF US POSITION, MISSION MAY WISH TO DRAW ON FOLLOWING ARGUMENTS AS WELL AS THOSE OUTLINED IN REFTEL E.

2. WE ARE IN FULL AGREEMENT WITH ALLIED SENTIMENT THAT ANY DECISION ON DEFINITIONS ISSUE WOULD BE PREMATURE AT THIS TIME, AMONG OTHER REASONS BECAUSE OF ITS POSSIBLE IMPLICATION FOR ALLIED POSITIONS ON A WHOLE SERIES OF OTHER ISSUES SUCH AS THE INCLUSION OF AIR MANPOWER IN THE COMMON CEILING AND SUB-CEILINGS. CONSEQUENTLY, WE FULLY AGREE THAT ALLIES SHOULD SAY NOTHING TO THE EAST NOW WHICH MIGHT LIMIT OUR FLEXIBILITY ON OTHER ISSUES SUCH AS AIR MANPOWER IN THE

COMMON CEILING OR PREJUDICE OUR FUTURE OPTIONS ON RECATEGORY, INCLUDING THE POSSIBILITY OF STRICT ADHERENCE TO THE UNIFORM APPROACH.

3. NONETHELESS, WE CONCUR WITH ARGUMENTS OUTLINED IN REF E THAT THERE IS A POTENTIAL PROBLEM REGARDING POSSIBLE EASTERN PERCEPTIONS OF THE PRESENT ALLIED POSITION ON DEFINITIONS. WE BELIEVE THAT ANY MISAPPREHENSION COULD BE CORRECTED BY EXPLOITING THE TACTICAL OPENING OFFERED BY THE EAST (AS NOTED IN REFTEL E, PARA 2) AND BY MAKING THE POINT DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY TO THE EAST THAT THERE ARE ALTERNATIVES TO THE REDEFINITION PROPOSAL THEY HAVE PROPOSED (E.G., ASSIGNING ALL GROUND-BASED NATIONAL AIR DEFENSE PERSONNEL TO THE GROUND FORCE CATEGORY) WHOSE NUMERICAL EFFECTS ON THE EXISTING EAST-WEST GROUND FORCE DISPARITY WOULD BE MINIMAL. WE BELIEVE, MOREOVER, THAT THIS CAN BE DONE WITHOUT COMMITTING THE WEST IN ANY WAY TO ANY SPECIFIC RECATEGORY SCHEME OR TO THE NECESSITY OF RECATEGORY AS SUCH.

4. CONSEQUENTLY, THE ALLIED OBJECTIVE IN THE PRESENT ROUND
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 STATE 237183

SHOULD BE TO ADOPT A NON-COMMITTAL INTERIM POSITION. IN OUR VIEW, THE FRG COMPROMISE PROPOSAL MERELY RESTATES POSITIONS TAKEN BY ALLIED NEGOTIATORS DURING THE PAST ROUND WITHOUT TAKING INTO ACCOUNT THE NEGOTIATING RECORD ON THIS ISSUE.

5. MISSION MAY PROPOSE, SHOULD IT JUDGE IT DESIRABLE IN LIGHT OF ALLIED RESPONSE TO US REP'S EXCELLENT INTERVENTION IN SPC OF OCTOBER 2, EITHER (OR BOTH) OF THE FOLLOWING

AMENDMENTS.

A. AFTER FIRST SENTENCE OF FRG COMPROMISE PARA 5, THE FOLLOWING SENTENCE MIGHT BE ADDED: "AFTER THERE HAS BEEN AN EXCHANGE OF DATA, ALLIED NEGOTIATORS MIGHT BE PREPARED TO DISCUSS, AS ONE OF SEVERAL POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS, A SOLUTION THAT, IN THE CASE OF THESE THREE TYPES OF FORCES, WOULD ASSIGN SIMILAR FORCES TO THE SAME FORCE CATEGORY, EITHER GROUND OR AIR FORCES, ON BOTH SIDES."

B. AS ALTERNATIVE TO OR IN CONJUNCTION WITH A) MISSION MIGHT PROPOSE FOLLOWING SENTENCE AFTER "...CAN BE ENVISAGED, AT END OF FRG COMPROMISE PARA 5; "THEY SHOULD INDICATE THAT PLACING ALL GROUND-BASED NATIONAL AIR DEFENSE PERSONNEL IN GROUND FORCES WOULD BE ONE OF SEVERAL POSSIBILITIES"

6. IN ADDITION, MISSION SHOULD POINT OUT THAT PHRASES "ONE OF SEVERAL POSSIBILITIES" AND "ONE OF SEVERAL POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS WOULD LEAVE WAY OPEN TO AN OUTCOME

INVOLVING NO REDEFINITION AS DESIRED BY UK AND FRG REPS (REFTEL C, PARA 7).

7. WITH REGARD TO MISSION'S SUGGESTION (REFTEL C, PARA 11), WE WOULD BE PREPARED TO ACCEPT "DIFFICULTIES" INSTEAD OF "ANOMALIES."

8. MISSION SHOULD CONTINUE TO EMPHASIZE THAT OUR PURPOSE IN INCLUDING "BUT ONLY AS REGARDS THESE THREE TYPES OF FORCES," WAS TO PRECLUDE THE POSSIBILITY THAT EVEN A CONDITIONAL EXPRESSION OF ALLIED WILLINGNESS TO DEAL WITH THESE THREE FORCE ANOMALIES MIGHT BE CITED BY THE EAST AS A PRECEDENT REQUIRING THE ALLIES TO DEAL WITH OTHER FORCE
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 04 STATE 237183

ANOMALIES THAT EAST MIGHT SUBSEQUENTLY CHOOSE TO RAISE. CONSEQUENTLY, TO PROTECT THE ALLIED POSITION, WE BELIEVE GUIDANCE SHOULD IN SOME WAY MAKE CLEAR TO THE EAST THAT WESTERN RECOGNITION OF THE NEED TO DEAL WITH THE THREE ANOMALIES IN QUESTION INVOLVES NO COMMITMENT WITH RESPECT TO OTHER ANOMALIES THE EAST MIGHT SUBSEQUENTLY RAISE.

9. AS ALTERNATIVE TO PHRASE "BUT ONLY AS REGARDS THESE THREE TYPES OF FORCES," MISSION MIGHT WISH TO PROPOSE THE FOLLOWING AMENDMENT TO THE FRG LANGUAGE: "CONSEQUENTLY, ALLIED RECOGNITION OF THE NEED TO RESOLVE THE ANOMALIES IN THESE THREE SPECIFIC CASES DOES NOT CONNOTE ALLIED AGREEMENT AS TO THE SPECIFIC DISPOSITION OF EACH OF THE THREE CASES, NOR DOES IT CONSTITUTE ANY ALLIED COMMITMENT WITH RESPECT TO OTHER ANOMALIES THE EAST MIGHT SUBSEQUENTLY

ASSERT EXIST UNDER WESTERN UNIFORM DEFINITION. WITH RESPECT TO THE THREE SPECIFIC CASES ALREADY RAISED BY THE EAST, ALLIED NEGOTIATORS SHOULD EMPHASIZE THAT SOLUTIONS OTHER THAN THOSE SUGGESTED BY THE EAST CAN BE ENVISAGED."

10. THOUGH OUR PREFERENCE WOULD HAVE BEEN TO KEEP PARA 4 (C) SEPARATE FROM PARA 5, WE CAN ACCEPT COMBINING THE TWO. HOWEVER, MISSION MIGHT REMIND THE SPC THAT PARA 4 (C) WAS INTENDED AS A RESPONSE TO THIRD GOAL PROPOSED BY THE EAST DURING THE LAST ROUND--I.E., THAT LIKE FORCES BE ASSIGNED TO LIKE CATEGORIES ON EITHER SIDE. KISSINGER

SECRET

NNN

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 01 JAN 1994
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: BALANCED FORCE REDUCTIONS, FORCE & TROOP LEVELS, MEETINGS
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 04 OCT 1975
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: ElyME
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1975STATE237183
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: ABOHLEN
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: GS
Errors: N/A
Film Number: D750344-0868
From: STATE
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1975/newtext/t19751082/aaaacvod.tel
Line Count: 180
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM
Office: ORIGIN ACDA
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 4
Previous Channel Indicators: n/a
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: n/a
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: ElyME
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 04 APR 2003
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <04 APR 2003 by SmithRJ>; APPROVED <07 OCT 2003 by ElyME>
Review Markings:

Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
06 JUL 2006

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: MBFR: DEFINITION OF FORCES
TAGS: PARM, NATO, MBFR
To: NATO BRUSSELS
Type: TE
Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 06 JUL 2006